

REMARKS

Claims 1-56 were presented for examination. In an Office Action dated June 4, 2007, claims 1-56 were rejected. Claims 1-4, 22, 27, 28-30, 48 and 53 are amended herein to more distinctly claim Applicants' invention. These changes are believed not to introduce new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested. In making these amendments, Applicants do not concede that the subject matter of the prior claims was in fact disclosed or taught by the cited prior art. Rather, Applicants reserve the right to pursue such protection at a later point in time in this or another application.

Applicants thank the Examiner for examination of the claims pending in this application and address the Examiner's comments below. Based on the above Amendment and following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and withdraw them.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC § 112, Paragraph 2

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 22, 27, 48, and 53 (and their dependent claims) under 35 USC § 112, ¶ 2 as allegedly not specifically pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter that the Applicants regard as the invention. The Examiner found that the term "implicit query" in these claims renders the claims indefinite.

An implicit query is a query where the user does not perform a conscious search for information. An implicit query is generated based upon information concerning a user's current context. Applicants have amended the terminology of claims 1, 22, 27, 48 and 53 to recite a method of ranking article identifiers of "a result set from an implicit query implied from a user's current context" and "receiving an event concerning the user's current context"

in order to convey a clear explanation of the term “implicit query.” Paragraphs [0018] and [0019] of the specification provide support for this clarification.

This amendment has been made to improve readability of the claims, and does not narrow the scope of protection with respect to the prior art, or with respect to potentially infringing devices/compositions/articles.

Response to Rejections Under 35 USC 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-56 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ryan et al. (“Ryan”) U.S. Patent No. 6,421,675, in view of Knight et al. (“Knight”) U.S. Patent No. 6,571,234. This rejection is traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite a method of ranking article identifiers of a result set from an implicit query implied from a user’s current context, the method comprising “receiving an event concerning the user’s current context, wherein the event comprises a user interaction with an article stored on a local client device.” These features of the claimed invention are beneficial because the result set will comprise of article identifiers relevant to the current user at that particular time.

Ryan does not teach or suggest “receiving an event concerning the user’s current context, wherein the event comprises a user interaction with an article stored on a local client device.” Ryan discloses a user’s explicit keyword entry into an interface of the search engine (the event) to generate a result set. (See, e.g., col. 4, ln. 49-51.) There is no disclosure or suggestion in Ryan of the event comprising “a user interaction with an article stored on a

local client device.” Ryan’s interaction is with an internet search engine which is not stored on a local device.

Knight does not remedy the deficiencies of Ryan. There is no disclosure or suggestion in Knight of the event comprising “a user interaction with an article stored on a local client device.” Knight discloses a system and method for managing an online message board. (See Title and Abstract.) This differs from the claimed invention because in Knight, messages are presented to the user based upon interactions in the **online message board**, not a user interaction with an article stored on a local client device. (Emphasis added.)

Applicants respectfully submit that for at least these reasons claim 1 is patentable over Ryan and Knight, both alone and in combination. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the rejection, and withdraw it.

As amended, independent claims 22, 27, 48, and 53 similarly recite “receiving an event concerning the user’s current context, wherein the event comprises a user interaction with an article stored on a local client device.” Therefore, all arguments advanced above with reference to this limitation of claim 1 apply equally to claims 22, 27, 48 and 53.

Claims 2 and 28 has been amended to recite “ranking the article identifiers is based at least in part on a preference of a current user.” The change has been made to clarify that the ranking of article identifiers is based upon preferences of a current user and not a general preference setting. Ryan does not disclose a method of ranking article identifiers based at least in part on the **preference of a current user**. (Emphasis Added.) Ryan discloses updating a database which comprises the selection of specific web pages by **many different users**. (Emphasis added) (See Ryan, e.g., col. 2, ln. 25-36.) Thus, in Ryan the ranking of article identifiers is not based on the preference of a current user, but on the preferences of

many different users. Similarly, Knight does not disclose a method of ranking article identifiers based at least in part on the preference of a current user. Knight discloses extracting and tabulating keywords in postings and queries to build a numerical ranking or index of subjects that are of current interest to the **community**. (Emphasis added) (See Knight, e.g., col. 20, ln. 10-13.) Neither reference ranks article identifiers based at least in part on the preference of a current user. Therefore, at least for these reasons, Applicants submit that claims 2 and 28 are patentable over the combination of Ryan in view of Knight.

Claims 8 and 34 recite “ranking the article identifiers comprises determining a rank that is proportional to the log of the sum of a first constant plus the term frequency and inversely proportional to the log of the sum of a second constant plus the document frequency.” Ryan discloses ranking “could be a function of the frequency that the keyword is used.” (As noted by the Examiner, see Ryan, e.g., col. 13, ln. 59-60.) Ryan does not disclose ranking article identifiers proportional to the log of the sum of a first constant plus the term frequency and inversely proportional to the log of the sum of a second constant plus the document frequency. Knight also does not disclose, “ranking the article identifiers comprises determining a rank that is proportional to the log of the sum of a first constant plus the term frequency and inversely proportional to the log of the sum of a second constant plus the document frequency,” nor does the Examiner suggest that it does. Therefore, at least for these reasons, Applicants submit that claims 8 and 34 are patentable over Ryan in view of Knight.

Claims 13 and 39 recite “ranking the article identifiers is based at least in part on capitalization data.” Capitalization data can comprise, for example, data indicating whether one or more letters in a word are capitalized (See Applicants’ Specification, paragraph

[0052]). Ryan does not disclose that ranking the article identifiers is based at least in part on capitalization data. Ryan discloses associating symbols with particular keywords such as the symbol \$ with the keyword “bid” for example. (As noted by the Examiner, see Ryan, e.g., col. 31, ln. 28-30.) Knight also does not disclose, “ranking the article identifiers is based at least in part on capitalization data,” nor does the Examiner suggest that it does. Therefore, at least for these reasons, Applicants submit that these claims are patentable over Ryan in view of Knight.

As the remainder of the claims depend either directly or indirectly from the patentable independent claims discussed above, all arguments advanced above with respect to independent claims are hereby incorporated so as to apply to these dependent claims as well. In addition, dependent claims 2-21, 23-26, 28-47, and 49-52 recite other patentable features which further distinguish them from the prior art of record. Applicants submit that these dependent claims are patentable over Ryan and Knight, both alone and in combination, by reason of their dependency, in addition to the further patentable limitations recited therein.

Conclusion

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims now pending are patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons given above, while not necessarily conceding any contention not specifically addressed. Applicants request reconsideration of the basis for the rejections of these claims and request allowance of them.

If the Examiner believes that for any reason direct contact with Applicants’ attorney would help advance the prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

Respectfully Submitted,

Niniane Wang et al.

Date: September 4, 2007

By: /Robin W. Reasoner/

Robin W. Reasoner, Attorney of Record
Registration No. 58,257
FENWICK & WEST LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650) 335-7172
Fax: (650) 938-5200
Email: rreasoner@fenwick.com